

REMARKS

Claims 1-23, 32-42, and 44-52 were pending as of the action mailed on May 29, 2008. Claims 10, 20, 23, 39, 42, 49, and 52 are currently amended for clarity. No new matter is added. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at least at page 7, lines 12-22 and page 8, lines 26-30. Reconsideration of the action is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 11, 15-16, 18, 32-33, 35, 37-38, 44-45, and 47-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Eudora® Email, User Manual for Windows, Version 5.1.1, 2001 by Qualcomm Inc., <http://www.eudora.com/techsupport/kb/2350hq.html> ("Eudora"). However, the examiner does not rely on the user manual. Instead, the examiner relies on screenshots taken from Eudora version 5.1.1. The cited link corresponds to a download page for old Eudora installers and not a user manual. Thus, the applicant's remarks are directed to the cited screenshots used by the examiner.

Claim 1.

Claim 1 recites displaying a table of data as an element of a graphical user interface display and displaying a set of markers, each marker being associated with a row of the table or each marker being associated with a column of the table, the table of data having two or more sort keys having a sort key order including a most significant sort key, each sort key being a row or each sort key being a column of the table, each sort key having a sort direction, each sort key having a position in the sort key order.

The examiner states that Eudora discloses the claimed sort keys having a sort key order. The applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited screenshot from Eudora shows two columns of an email application, specifically a "who" column and a "size" column. However, the screenshot does not disclose the sort key order for the sort keys. While the "who" column includes an arrow indicating a sort direction, which is distinct from a sort key order. There is no disclosure of sort key order in the cited screenshot. Based on the cited screenshot, either column could be the most

significant sort key. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-19, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 6.

Claim 6 recites representing a sort key order visually in a table by displaying markers with a pattern of distinct visual properties. Thus, claim 6 requires a display of more than one marker.

The examiner states that Eudora discloses representing a sort key order visually in a table by displaying markers with a pattern of distinct visual properties. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, the examiner states that Eudora discloses this at “pg. 2-3: triangle indicates the most significant sort key” (Office Action at page 4). Thus, the examiner has identified a single marker associated with a sort key. However, the examiner has not identified any other displayed marker. Additionally, the identified marker discloses sort direction for a particular key. It is not identified as a marker representing a sort key order.

Moreover, claim 6 explicitly requires a display of “markers” with a pattern of distinct visual properties. A single marker identifying one sort key does not disclose or suggest representing a sort key order by displaying multiple markers with a pattern of distinct visual properties, as required by claim 6. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is allowable.

Claim 7.

Claim 7 depends from claim 6 and further recites that the pattern of distinct visual properties indicates the sort key order. As set for the above, the cited portion of Eudora only discloses a single marker. Thus, Eudora further fails to disclose or suggest that the pattern of markers indicates the sort key order. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 11.

Claim 11 recites determining whether the user-selected marker is associated with the most significant key, and if the user-selected marker is associated with the most significant key,

changing a sort direction of the most significant key, and if the user-selected marker is not associated with the most significant key, establish the row or column associated with the user-selected marker as the most significant sort key, and maintain the positions and the sort directions of the remaining sort keys in the sort key order.

The examiner states that Eudora discloses changing a sort direction of a most significant key if the user-selected marker is associated with the most significant key. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the examiner states “pg. 2-3 “Who” column is not most significant”. However, this statement by the examiner contradicts the condition where the user selected marker is associated with the most significant key. Furthermore, the cited portion of Eudora does not disclose or suggest changing the sort direction of the most significant sort key.

Claim 11 further requires a determination of whether the user-selected marker is associated with the most significant key. Since Eudora does not disclose or suggest changing the sort direction of the most significant sort key based on the determination, Eudora does not disclose or suggest making the required determination. Therefore, Eudora does not disclose all of the features of claim 11 as required to support an anticipation rejection. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is allowable.

Claim 16.

Claim 16 recites instructions to determine whether the table of data has a predetermined number of sort keys, and if the table of data has a predetermined number of sort keys, remove a least significant sort key from the sort key order, establish the row or column associated with a user-selected marker as the most significant sort key, and maintain positions and sort directions of the remaining sort keys in the sort key order.

The examiner states that Eudora discloses this feature of claim 16. The applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, the examiner states that Eudora discloses removing a least significant sort key from a sort key order. Specifically, the examiner states, after reciting this feature of claim 16, “pg. 3: “Who” is selected”. It is not readily clear to the applicant how this relates to the recited feature of removing the least significant sort key from the sort key order. The cited screenshot from Eudora shows a mail interface with two columns, “who” and “size”,

displayed. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of a sort key that has been removed from the sort order.

Furthermore, claim 16 requires a determination as to whether the table of data has the predetermined number of sort keys. Since Eudora does not disclose or suggest removing the least significant sort key based on the determination, then Eudora does not disclose making the determination as required by claim 16. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 37 and 47.

Claims 37 and 47 include features corresponding to those of claims 1 and 11 and were rejected for the same reasons. For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 11, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 37 and 47 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 38 and 48.

Claims 38 and 48 include features corresponding to those of claim 16 and were rejected for the same reasons. For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 16, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 38 and 48 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 32 and 44.

Claims 32 and 44 include features corresponding to those of claim 1 and were rejected for the same reasons. For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 32 and 44, as well as claims 33-36 and 45-46, which depend from claims 32 and 44, respectively, are in condition for allowance.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 5 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Eudora. Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Eudora in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,704,051 ("Lane"). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Eudora in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,006,722 ("Adelson"). Claims 12, 13, 20, 34, 39 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Eudora in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,586,311 ("Davies"). Claims 21, 40 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Eudora, in view

of Davies, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,396,621 ("MacGregor"). Claims 14, 22, 41 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Eudora in view of Davies and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,706,449 ("Liu"). Claims 17, 36 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Eudora in view of Davies and in further view Liu. Claims 23, 42 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Eudora in view of Davies and in further view of MacGregor.

Claim 10.

Claim 10 was rejected over Eudora and Adelson. Claim 10 recites the pattern of distinct visual properties comprises a set of distinct non-textual representations identifying a sequence of each sort key in the sort key order.

The examiner states that Eudora does not disclose a pattern of distinct visual properties as a set of non-textual representation of the sort key order, but that Adelson does. The applicant respectfully disagrees. The applicant notes that the examiner fails to identify any particular portion of Adelson as disclosing the recited feature of claim 10. Adelson discloses a system for displaying types and numbers of flaws during inspection of a moving web of material (e.g., paper, fabric, plastic, or foil being wound to a roll). *See* col. 1, lines 23-27; col. 2, lines 21-25. A display matrix includes a matrix of discrete areas corresponding to a flaw type. The color of the areas change when a threshold number of flaws are detected. *See* col. 1, lines 28-34.

While disclosing colors indicating a number of flaws of a particular type, Adelson does not disclose or suggest a non-textual pattern identifying a sequence of each sort key in the sort key order, as required by claim 10. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 20, 39, and 49.

Claims 20, 39, and 49 were rejected over Eudora and Davies. The respective claims recite displaying a table of data as an element of a graphical user interface display and displaying a set of markers, each marker being associated with a row of the table or each marker being associated with a column of the table, the table of data having two or more sort keys having a sort key order including a most significant sort key, each sort key being a row or each sort key

being a column of the table, each sort key having a sort direction, each sort key having a position in the sort key order. As set forth above with respect to claim 1, Eudora does not disclose or suggest each sort key having a position in the sort key order. Davies does not remedy this deficiency as Davies also fails to disclose or suggest each sort key having a position in a sort key order. Thus, claims 20, 39, and 49 are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 20, 39, and 49 further recite receiving from the user one input gesture selecting a marker by dragging the marker from a location associated with a particular row or column of the table to another area of the graphical user interface display. The examiner states that Eudora fails to disclose dragging markers, but that Davies does at col. 5, lines 8-21. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Davies discloses an object oriented system for accessing and analyzing data. *See* col. 1, lines 52-54. A user interface is provided that allows a user to interactively operate the system using graphics objects. *See* col. 1, lines 59-61. The graphics objects allow the user to visually manipulate analysis objects for creating an analysis network. *See* col. 1, lines 62-64. Drag and drop techniques are used to move databases into the analysis network and to apply analysis functionalities to the databases based on interconnections between graphics objects. *See* col. 1, line 67 to col. 2, line 4. The generated analysis network is interpreted in order to provide access to the designated data. *See* col. 2, lines 5-7.

In particular, the cited portion of Davis at col. 5, lines 8-21, reads as follows:

The user next proceeds to modify or build from scratch the analysis network by dragging and dropping object tools 91 (icons) into the data analysis network 92. For example, object tools 91 shown in FIG. 3 include composite filter 94, variable filter 96, aggregation 98, sort criteria 100, match 102, flight leg 104 and DD service 106. Object tools 91 are dragged and dropped into the data analysis network 92 and connected by clicking on one object tool icon 91 and then drawing a line 108 to a second icon. The object tools 91 are analysis control objects 40. The object tools 91 and connecting lines 108 of the analysis network 92 actuate the generation of arithmetic equations and logical statements, and the generation SQL statements as discussed with respect to FIG. 1.

The cited portion refers to dragging and dropping object tools to the analysis network shown in FIG. 3. One of the object tools specifically identified by the examiner is an object tool called "sort criteria". However, the cited portion does not disclose or suggest how the sort criteria object tool interacts with other objects of the analysis network or what data is being sorted. Moreover, the cited portion does not disclose or suggest that the object tool is the claimed marker. In particular, the claimed marker is associated with a particular column or row of a table. Davies does not disclose or suggest the object tools as associated with any columns or rows. Consequently, the objects in Davies which can be positioned in an area of a graphical user interface display do not disclose or suggest dragging a marker from a location associated with a particular row or column to another area of a graphical user interface display.

The applicant respectfully submits that claims 20, 39, and 49 are in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claims 21-22, 40-41, and 50-51, which depend from claims 20, 39, and 49, respectively, are also allowable.

Claims 23, 42, and 52.

Claims 23, 42, and 52 were rejected over Eudora, Davies, and MacGregor. Claim 23, 42, and 52 recite receiving from a user one input gesture selecting a marker by dragging the marker from a location associated with a particular row or column of a table to a location within an area of the graphical user interface display. Claims 23, 42, and 52 also recite establishing the row or column associated with the user-selected marker as a sort key having a position in a sort key order defined by the location within the area in response to the input gesture, and maintain the positions and the sort directions of the remaining sort keys in the sort key order. Thus, the position of the marker identifies a particular sort key as having a particular position in the sort key order.

The examiner states that neither Eudora nor Davies disclose establishing the row or column associated with the user-selected marker as a sort key having a position in a sort key order defined by the location within the area in response to the input gesture, but that MacGregor discloses this feature in FIG. 6(b). The applicant respectfully disagrees. FIG. 6(b) of MacGregor shows a dialog window that allows a user to manually identify particular cells of a

grid to be sorted in a particular sort order. However, this does not disclose or suggest dragging a marker from a location associated with a particular row or column to a location that defines a position in a sort key order, as required by claim 23, 42, and 52.

The applicant respectfully submits that claims 23, 42, and 52 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any other charges or any credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 26, 2008

/Brian J. Gustafson/

Brian J. Gustafson

Reg. No. 52,978

Customer No. 21876
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945